

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

- (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.
- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1, 3-5, 7, 9, 11-13, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by *Roach, Jr.* (5845211).

Regarding **claims 1 and 9**, *Roach, Jr.* discloses an access network adapted to communicate with a mobile terminal and packet service nodes in a core network portion of a mobile telecommunications network, said access network comprising:

a plurality of local base stations each defining a mini-cell and adapted to communicate with mobile terminals located in a respective mini-cell over an unlicensed-radio interface (=see Fig.1, item 114, which disclose multiple base stations; and col.13, lines 33-38, which teaches the modification of a base station to include the components of an ICS, which reads on the adapted communication via mini-cells over unlicensed-radio interface); and

an access network controller connected to a packet service node in said core network portion and adapted to communicate with said packet service node over a predetermined licensed mobile network interface, and connected to said plurality of local base stations (=see Fig.5A, wherein item 130 connects to item 110, which reads on the access network controller connecting to a packet service node, which is conducted over a predetermined licensed mobile network, see Fig.1, for further visualization);

said mini-cells being grouped into at least two packet service cells with at least two mini-cells in each packet service cell and-said local base stations being assigned a cell identifier comprising a first identifier portion that is common for all local base stations connected to said access network controller and a second identifier portion that is common for all local base stations in the same packet service cell but different for local base stations in different packet service cells (=see Fig.5A, item 110 ("Cellsite#1" and "Cellsite#2" reads on mini-cells; and col.14, lines 15-33).

Regarding **claims 3 and 11**, *Roach, Jr.* discloses an access network as claimed in claim 1, wherein said access network controller is adapted to communicate to said packet service node location update messages from mobile stations containing first and second identifier portions of a cell identifier (=see Fig.4B, wherein the ISDN/PPSN reads on the packet service node).

Regarding **claims 4 and 12**, *Roach, Jr.* discloses an access network as claimed in claim 1 wherein said core network comprises a plurality of voice switching nodes, wherein said access network controller is connected to one voice switching node, and

only said first identifier portion is configured in said voice switching nodes in the core network portion (=see Fig.6, item 113, which reads on one connected, and item 130 reads on the access network controller).

Regarding **claims 5 and 13**, *Roach, Jr.* discloses an access network as claimed in claim 4. wherein said access network controller is adapted to receive a handover request from the voice switching node connected thereto, wherein said handover request contains only said first identifier portion of said cell identifier (=see col.24, lines 43-50; and Fig.7B, item 720).

Regarding **claims 7 and 15**, *Roach, Jr.* discloses an access network as claimed in claim 1, further comprising a fixed broadband network connecting said plurality of local base stations with said access network controller (=see Fig.1, item 130, 126; wherein the items 122, 124, and 126 read on broadband, since communication to/from said items requires broadband).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2617

4. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148

USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining

obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

5. Claims 2, 6, 8, 10, 14, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over *Roach, Jr.* in view of *Ramos-Escano et al* (7,546,145 B2)(hereinafter *Ramos-Escano*).

Regarding **claims 2, and 10**, *Roach, Jr.* discloses an access network as claimed in claim 1, but does not clearly teach: wherein said access network controller is assigned a cell identifier comprising said first identifier.

However, in the same field of endeavor, *Ramos-Escano* does teach: wherein said access network controller is assigned a cell identifier comprising said first identifier (=see col.7, table; wherein the RNCID-EXT reads on the cell identifier).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have combined the teachings of *Roach, Jr.* and *Ramos-Escano* to improve the architecture in order to overcome the disclosed limitations stated in *Ramos-Escano* (=see col. 26-40).

Regarding **claims 6 and 14**, *Roach, Jr.* discloses an access network as claimed in claim 1, but does not clearly teach: wherein said local base stations are adapted to communicate said cell identifier to mobile terminals in said mini-cells.

However, in the same field of endeavor, *Ramos-Escano* does teach: wherein said local base stations are adapted to communicate said cell identifier to mobile terminals in said mini-cells (=see col.4, lines18-24, wherein the “downlink signaling” reads on communicate to mobile terminals).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have combined the teachings of *Roach, Jr.* and *Ramos-Escano* to improve the architecture in order to over come the disclosed limitations stated in *Ramos-Escano* (=see col. 26-40).

Regarding **claims 8 and 16**, *Roach, Jr.* discloses an access network as claimed in claim 1, but does not clearly teach: wherein said cell identifiers are dynamically assigned to said mini-cells by said access network controller.

However, in the same field of endeavor, *Ramos-Escano* does teach: wherein said cell identifiers are dynamically assigned to said mini-cells by said access network controller (=see col.7, table; wherein it is understood that the final RNC ID provided is dynamically assigned based on the method cited in the table).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have combined the teachings of *Roach, Jr.* and *Ramos-Escano* to improve the architecture in order to over come the disclosed limitations stated in *Ramos-Escano* (=see col. 26-40).

### **Conclusion**

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JOHN B. BYRD JR. whose telephone number is (571)270-7463. The Examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 7:30am - 5:00pm, EST.

The supervisor, Charles Appiah, can be reached on 571-272-7904, if you are unable to resolve the matter with the assigned Examiner. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/JOHN B BYRD JR./  
Examiner, Art Unit 2617

/Charles N. Appiah/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617